DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 839 SP 014 631

AUTHOR Lukin, Fay Paula
TITLE Student Teaching Competencies in Lehman College's Competency-Based Teacher Education Program.
SPONS AGENCY City Univ. of New York, Bronx, N.Y. Herbert H. Lehman Coll.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; *Evaluation Criteria; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Preservice Education; Program Evaluation; *Student Teaching; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to establish the rank ordering of the 17 personal and professional traits identified by Lehman College as "student teacher competencies," this questionnaire was circulated to 87 student and cooperating teachers during the fall 1977 and the spring 1978 semesters. The results indicate a medium to high level of consistency in the rating of competency importance by the participating personnel, with the competency "provision for individuality" scoring the highest in all instances. The survey investigates the correlation between competency significance and teacher training subject emphases and provides recommendations for changes in student teaching competency criteria. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175839

STUDENT TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN LEHMAN COLLEGE'S COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

BY

FAY PAULA LUKIN

Home Address: 2215 Cruger Avenue
Bronx, New York 10467
(212) 231-5762

Title: Elementary School Teacher
Bronx, New York

Study was sponsored and supported by the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Division of Education, Herbert H. Lehman College of the City University of New York, Bronx. Study was submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Education, May 1977.

SP 012 631

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fay Paula Lukin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STUDENT TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN LEHMAN COLLEGE'S COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the relative importance of and the extent of development of the seventeen student teaching competencies in Lehman College's Undergraduate Competency-Based Teacher Education Program.

The Fall 1976 and Spring 1977 semesters each had eighty-seven questionnaires distributed to the student teachers, their cooperating teachers from two school districts in The Bronx, and the student teachers' college supervisors. Almost two-thirds (62%) of the questionnaires were returned in the Fall, 1976. About three out of four (78%) were returned in the Spring, 1977.

The response of the cooperating teachers, the student teachers, and the college supervisors were analyzed separately, as well as together. The competency: "provision for individuality" was considered the most important by all respondents for both semesters. The competencies: "uses commercially available tests" and "describes use of various media" were felt to be the least important competencies. The competency: "classroom routines" was considered both semesters to be the one the cooperating teachers helped most to develop. The competency: "describes use of various media" was considered to be the least helped in development.

Spearman rank order correlation indicated a close relationship between the importance of the competencies and the help the student teachers received from their cooperating

teachers for all groups except the college supervisors for Fall 1976. Spring 1977 showed the same relationship for all the groups without exception. Except for cooperating teachers and college supervisors for Fall 1976, and college supervisors and student teachers for Spring 1977, the groups were in general agreement with respect to rank order importance of the competencies. Except for college supervisors and cooperating teachers for Spring 1977, the groups were in general agreement with respect to rank order development of the competencies.

Open-ended responses regarding the addition of, deletion of, and general comments concerning competencies were analyzed and were considered under general recommendation.

STUDENT TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN LEHMAN COLLEGE'S
COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

As part of a growing national movement, the New York State Department of Education required that on or after September 1, 1975 those in preservice teacher training complete a state-approved competency-based teacher education (CBTE) program. Those who complete the program earn a N.Y.S. provisional certificate as an elementary school teacher (N-6).

CBTE means to develop the teacher as a professional. The teacher being identified with having the basic requirements of professional knowledge, skills and attitudes (competencies) desireable for a successful job.[1] The competencies, accurately performed by the student in the TE program, are based on assumprions held about the teacher and the pupil.[2]

New York State does not mandate what specific competencies or on what level they are to be achieved; what specific experiences or activities are to be used, (it does mandate that they be relevant); nor the specific kind of evidence that the competencies were achieved. Each program designer determines the competencies, their indicators, and the evaluation that are to be achieved.[3]

Since CBTE has shifted teacher education programs to a research - data - feedback component, allowing for program adjustment, it follows that a recommendation by the AACTE was that research should be an integral element in the development of all CBTE programs.[4] CBTE programs should be examined on their own merit, finding the specific competencies for the

effectiveness of that program.

Several researchers[5] agree that the relationship between the cooperating teacher (inservice teacher) and the student teacher plus the effectiveness of the cooperating teacher as a trainer of a student teacher is a key factor in a teacher education program. The student teacher spends more time in the cooperating teacher's classroom, where "on-the-job" training is done, than with the college supervisor; therefore, the cooperating teacher has a significant effect on the student teacher.

Lehman College's Undergraduate CBTE Program

Herbert H. Lehman College of the City University of New York has state-approval for their CBTE program which began in September 1975. Lehman's CBTE program consists of methods courses (including educational psychology), advisory groups and student teaching. The overall goal of the program is for students to have an understanding of how learning is nourished.

Demonstration of minimal competencies, made public in advance, are required and are documented before recommendation for provisional certification is made. There are, at present, seventeen student teaching competencies that the student teacher has to demonstrate. (Student teaching is one semester - half days.) The competencies were formulated by Lehman College departmental faculty, some being based on the AACTE's and other national associations' recommendations.

This study attempted to assess the relative importance and the extent of development of the seventeen student

Figure 1.

DO NOT RATE, but write in any other competencies you feel are important:_____

_____

_____

_____

DO NOT RATE, but write in any of the competencies you feel should be deleted from the present program:_____

_____

_____

_____

COMMENTS:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

EVALUATION OF LEHMAN COLLEGE'S UNDERGRADUATE
COMPETENCY-BASED ELEMENTARY TEACHER (N-VI) EDUCATION PROGRAM

FALL 1976

Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education

This is a questionnaire dealing with Herbert H. Lehman College's Undergraduate Competency-Based Teacher Education Program. The number on top of this questionnaire is for the purpose of bookkeeping. You will remain anonymous throughout the survey, please be frank and candid in your answers.
PLEASE READ CAREFULLY.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO YOU.

For Cooperating Teachers AND Student Teachers:

1. Check one: Cooperating Teacher_____ Student Teacher_____
2. I am presently teaching at_____ student teaching (Number and/or name of school)
3. I teach in grade(s)_____ student teach
4. I would like a summary of the results of this study at its completion (check one): Yes_____ No_____

For Cooperating Teachers ONLY:

Check one response for each statement.

1. My present student teacher is student teaching during the September 1976 to January 1977 semester____ February 1977 to June 1977 semester____
2. I was a field associate in Lehman College's Field Associate Program during the time of February 1973 to June 1975: Yes___ No_____

For Student Teachers ONLY:

Check one response for each statement.

1. I am presently student teaching during the September 1976 to January 1977 semester ___ February 1977 to June 1977 semester _____
2. My cooperating teacher was a field associate in Lehman College's Field Associate Program during the time of February 1973 to June 1975. (If you do not know the appropriate response to this statement, please ask your cooperating teacher): Yes_____ No_____

Figure 2. LEHMAN COLLEGE'S STUDENT TEACHING COMPETENCIES

Rating Student Teaching Competencies: Below are the 17 competencies for student teaching. Please give your opinion on their relative importance in student teaching and your reaction to the development of the competencies.

Importance Rating:

A) Rate the relative importance of the competencies according to the following rating scale (from 5-most important to 1-not important) Put the number you think appropriate in the space in the left-hand column below next to the number of the competency.

In Lehman College's Competency-Based Teacher Education Program, the relative importance of the competencies should be rated as: (using importance rating scale):

Importance Ratings:

Rating	Competency
____	1.
____	2.
____	3.
____	4.
____	5.
____	6.
____	7.
____	8.
____	9.
____	10.
____	11.
____	12.
____	13.
____	14.
____	15.
____	16.
____	17.

Importance Rating Scale:

5 most important 4 often important

3 somewhat important 2 rarely important 1 not important

Development Rating:

B) Rate the development of competencies according to the following rating scale (from 5-completely helps to develop to 1-does not help to develop). Put the number you think appropriate in the space on the right-hand column below.

Development Rating Scale:

5 completely helps to develop 4 often helps to develop

3 sometimes helps to develop 2 rarely helps to develop 1 does n not help to develop

To what extent do you feel the cooperating teacher helps the student teacher to develop the student teaching competencies? Using the development rating scal above place rating next to the number of the competency.

COMPETENCIES

1. The student plans instructional objectives including observable pupil behavior, conditions for learning and criteria for acceptable performance.
2. The student demonstrates skill in establishing effective communication with pupils and peers by performing various interpersonal skills.
3. The student analyzes his own and peer teaching performance and records objective data by various means (transcript, interaction analysis systems, audio and video tapes) on his verbal and non-verbal teaching behaviors and other classroom events.
4. The student employs questioning strategies that result in pupil thinking at various levels. The student selects activities which promote listening skills.
5. The student makes provision in planning and implementing learning activities for individual differences among learners and sets expectations and tasks accordingly.
6. The student teaches a class effectively for an entire morning.
7. The student effectively plans and implements a unit of work in each of two different subject areas.
8. The student effectively performs classroom routines.
9. The student is aware of role of parents in schools.
10. The student recognizes ethnic differences within a community, school or class and utilizes this diversity in curricula planning.
11. The student constructs objective and non-objective tests for classroom use.
12. The student interprets the results of an objective test.
13. The student uses commercially available tests effectively.
14. The student recognizes the racial, ethnic, or economic biases in educational assessment of minority children.
15. The student demonstrates an understanding of communication theory as related to learning.
16. The student operates instructional equipment likely to be available in a school and/or school district.
17. The student describes the relative and potential use of various media to solve specific problems in the classroom.

Development Ratings:

Competency	Rating
1.	____
2.	____
3.	____
4.	____
5.	____
6.	____
7.	____
8.	____
9.	____
10.	____
11.	____
12.	____
13.	____
14.	____
15.	____
16.	____
17.	____

(over)

teaching competencies in Lehman College's undergraduate preservice CBTE program. This was the first study done of the seventeen student teaching competencies since the program's inception. The objective of the study was to offer answers to the following questions:

1. Which of the seventeen student teaching competencies in the program were considered to be the most important and the least important by the cooperating teachers, the student teachers, and the college supervisors?

   a. What competencies in addition to those listed should be developed?

   b. Which of the listed competencies should be deleted?

2. Which of the student teaching competencies did the cooperating teachers help the student teachers develop?

3. Which of the student teaching competencies had the cooperating teachers not been able to help the student teachers develop?

Method

During late Autumn, 1976, eighty-seven questionnaires were distributed to the student teachers, their cooperating teachers and the college supervisors (Lehman College faculty). Almost two-thirds (62%) of the questionnaires were returned. A summary of the distribution and return is given in Table 1.

This was followed by a validation study in late Spring, 1977. The same questionnaire was distributed to a new group of student teachers, their cooperating teachers, in the same two school districts, as well as to the college supervisors.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO STUDENT TEACHER COMPETENCY QUESTIONNAIRE - FALL 1976 AND SPRING 1977 SEMESTERS

Respondents	Fall 1976		Spring 1977	
	No. of Questionnaires		No. of Questionnaires	
	Mailed	Returned	Mailed	Returned
Cooperating Teachers . .	41	25	41	28
Student Teachers . .	42	25	42	36
College Supervisors.	4	4	4	4
Total . .	87	54	87	68

Instead of mailing the questionnaire to the student teachers, it was administered during the last session of their student teaching seminar; the college supervisors also responded at this time. As in Autumn, the questionnaire was mailed to the cooperating teachers. Out of eighty-seven questionnaires distributed, 78%, or about three out of four were returned. (See Table 1 for breakdown.)

The questionnaire, developed by the writer with approval of the school districts and Lehman College, contained the list of the student teaching competencies. Copy of the questionnaire is shown in Figures 1 and 2. Respondents rated each of the seventeen student teaching competencies as to the relative importance of the competencies and the extent to which the cooperating teachers helped the student teachers develop the competencies. The rating scale for the relative importance of the competencies ranged from 5-"most important" to

1-"not important". The rating scale for development of the competencies ranged from 5-"completely helps to develop" to 1-"does not help to develop". Participants were given the opportunity to identify: (a) any additional competencies they felt important, (b) any of the competencies they felt should be deleted from the program, and (c) general comments.

The competencies rated according to importance and extent of development were analyzed: (1) by number and percentage of responses for each item on the 5 to 1 rating scale; (2) by rank based on average ratings for each competency. Spearman's rank order correlation[6] was used to compare the relationship of the ratings between several groups. Rank order correlation was determined between importance ratings and development ratings within the total group of respondents and within each group. (The validity of the responses of the college supervisors, 7% of the total response, was uncertain since there were so few respondents as compared to the group of cooperating teachers and the group of student teachers.) Rank order correlation was also determined for importance ratings between the groups: cooperating teachers and student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors, student teachers and college supervisors. The same was done for the development ratings. Open-ended responses regarding the addition of, deletion of, and general comments concerning competencies, were sorted into categories. Recommendations were developed based on these open-ended responses and the ratings.

Results and Discussion

The responses of the cooperating teachers, the student teachers, and the college supervisors were analyzed separately, as well as together.

Findings - Fall 1976

The competencies considered most important by all the respondents were Competency No. 5 - "provision for individuality"[7] and Competency No. 8 - "classroom routines". These same competencies were also rated as the ones which the cooperating teachers helped most to develop. The least important and least developed competencies were Competency No. 13 - "uses commercially available tests" and Competency No. 17 - "describes use of various media".

Spearman rank order correlation indicated that there was a close relationship between the importance of the competencies and the help the student teachers received from their cooperating teachers for all groups except the college supervisors. Also, cooperating teachers and student teachers, as well as student teachers and college supervisors were in general agreement with respect to rank order of the importance and development of the competencies. Cooperating teachers and college supervisors did not agree in the importance ratings.

Findings - Spring 1977

All respondents felt that the most important competencies were Competency No. 2 - "demonstrates skill" and Competency No. 5 - "provision for individuality" and the least important competencies were Competency No. 13 - "uses commercially

available tests" and Competency No. 17 - "describes use of various media". The total group also felt the competencies the cooperating teachers helped most to develop were Competency No. 8 - "classroom routines" and Competency No. 1 - "plans instructional objectives". The competencies least developed were Competency No. 12 - "interprets test results" and Competency No. 17 - "describes use of various media".

Rank order correlation indicated that there was a close relationship between the importance of the competencies and the help the student teachers received from the cooperating teachers not only for the total group but also within each group. Except for college supervisors and student teachers, the groups were in general agreement with respect to rank order importance of the competencies. Except for college supervisors and cooperating teachers, the groups were in general agreement with respect to rank order development of the competencies.

The competencies felt to be developed with the help of the cooperating teachers were positively correlated with those the cooperating teachers felt to be important. The significant correlation between the cooperating teachers and the student teachers for importance showed the effect of the cooperating teachers on the student teachers. Therefore, the more important the competency, as felt by the cooperating teachers, the more help the student teachers received in developing that competency. The student teacher, who received more help on the competency, then felt that competency was important, too.

Competency No. 5 - "provision for individuality" was considered important both semesters. Competency No. 13 - "uses commercially available tests" and Competency No. 17 - "describes use of various media" were felt to be the least important competencies by all respondents for both semesters.

Competency No. 8 - "classroom routines" was considered both semesters to be the most helped in development. Competency No. 17 - "describes use of various media" was considered both semesters to be the least helped in development.

The results of the Spearman rank order correlation indicated continuous lack of communication between the groups involved in the undergraduate CBTE program. The college supervisors did not agree with the cooperating teachers in Autumn, and with the student teachers in the Spring, as to which competencies were important. Also, the college supervisors and the cooperating teachers did not agree, in the Spring, as to the rank order development of the competencies as they had in the Autumn.

The competencies, for both importance and development, at the top of the list of the seventeen student teaching competencies had a greater percentage of responses for the rating of 5 than those competencies on the bottom of the list. This showed competencies on the top (Competencies Nos. 1 thru 8) were more important and more developed than those on the bottom of the list (Competencies Nos. 9 thru 17). Table 2 shows rank order importance and development ratings of all respondents for Fall and Spring semesters.

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE AND DEVELOPMENT RATINGS OF ALL RESPONDENTS - FALL 1976 AND SPRING 1977 SEMESTERS

Fall 1976				Spring 1977			
Importance Ratings		Development Ratings		Importance Ratings		Development Ratings	
Rank Order	Competency Number	Rank Order	Competency Number	Rank Order	Competency Number	Rank Order	Competency Number
1	4	1	8	1	2	1	8
2	5	2	5	2	5	2	1
3	2	3	6	3	4	3	5
4	1	4	4	4	1	4	6
5	8	5	1	5	6	5	4
6	6	6	7	6	8	6	2
7	9	7	16	7.5	9	7	7
8	12	8	9	7.5	15	8	9
9.5	7	9	2	9	14	9	15
9.5	16	10.5	3	10	10	10	14
11	3	10.5	11	11	7	11	10
12	14	12	10	12	3	12	16
13	10	13	12	13	12	13	11
14	11	14.5	14	14	16	14	13
15	15	14.5	15	15	11	15	3
16	17	16	17	16	17	16	17
17	13	17	13	17	13	17	12

In the Spring 1977 semester, as in the Fall 1976 semester, it was concluded that Lehman College's CBTE program, itself, was successful, but some of the student teaching competencies were vague. It was concluded that certain competencies were ommitted from the program; and the communication among those involved in the program needed improvement.

The study of the Spring 1977 semester supported and reaffirmed the early study.

Recommendations

The results from both semesters indicated a need for change in the student teaching competencies. The following recommendations were made based on the results.

A. Master Teacher as Model

1. Competency No. 3 should be changed from: "The student analyzes his own and peer teaching performance..." to read: "The student analyzes his own and a variety of inservice teachers' teaching performance...."

B. Competencies - Different Focus

1. Competency No. 13 should be changed from: The student uses commercially available tests effectively" to read: "The student uses and analyzes results of commercially available diagnostic tests".

2. Competency No. 17: "The student describes the relative and potential use of various media to solve specific problems in the classroom" should be deleted from the list of student teaching competencies.

3. The following competency should be added: "The student

creates a pleasant and comfortable physical environment for the pupils". The indicators for this competency should include: (a) Provides learning centers for a variety of independent and small group activities. (b) Works with pupils to provide interesting displays and bulletin boards, relevant to instructional objectives and pupils' interests. (c) Provides alternative learning settings (e.g. field trips, community walks).

4. The following competency should be added: "The student uses a variety of commercial and/or teacher-made teaching aids".

5. The following competency should be added: "The student understands and identifies appropriate specialized school personnel and resources".

6. The following competency should be added: "The student is familiar with the Board of Education's curriculum guidelines".

7. To allow for individual differences - the student teacher, with the help of the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher, develops one or two additional competencies, along with their indicators and the means of evaluating them. If many students choose a particular competency, it should be incorporated into the program.

C. New Courses

1. Competency No. 14: "The student recognizes the racial, ethnic, or economic biases in educational assessment of minority children" should be reworded to give a clearer meaning. In addition a required course should be given to the student teachers on the diversity of cultural backgrounds of

the pupils in the New York City public schools.

2. The ability for the student teacher to communicate and relate to pupils through oral and written skills should be further developed with a required course on penmanship: manuscript and cursive, both for use on chalkboard and marking papers.

D. Workshops

1. There should be a series of required workshops, in the beginning weeks of the semester, where the college supervisor fully explains to the student teachers the meaning of each of the student teaching competencies. Workshops should be held in the school so the cooperating teachers may attend.

2. Offer workshops, by college supervisors, to cooperating teachers on supervision of student teachers.

3. There should be a required workshop for the student teacher, offered by the college supervisor, on: taking attendance; the grading of report cards; and the grading and interpreting of record cards. Workshops should be held in the school so the cooperating teachers may attend.

E. Reorganization

1. Responsibility should be shared between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The student teacher spends more time with the cooperating teacher than with the college supervisor. The cooperating teacher should assume the role of the supervisor and the college supervisor should be a resource person. Therefore, the cooperating teacher should evaluate the student teacher, with the assistance of the college supervisor.

2. There should be the requirement that all methods courses and other education courses be completed before the start of student teaching.

3. Student teaching should be extended to one school year (September thru June) or five full days each week throughout the one semester.

F. Research

1. Competencies Nos. 9 thru 17 should be more carefully examined as to their clarity and/or importance.

2. Evaluation instruments should be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher, those who help the student teachers fulfill their responsibilities and learn the appropriate knowledge, attitudes and skills.

This is only a beginning. Intensive and continuous research for validation and relevance of the student teaching competencies and the ways they are developed needs to be carried out. Lehman College's preservice CBTE program would also benefit from a study of the student teaching competencies and their indicators and means of evaluation, not just the student teaching competencies alone; as well as evaluation of the methods courses and the other education courses in preparation for and relevance to student teaching. An in-depth study of these areas would be useful and productive.

Notes

[1]Iris M. Elfenbein, "Preservice Teacher Education Programs for consideration by the Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification", Draft, 10 November 1976 (Paper), p. 1.

[2]Pupil is the child in the elementary classroom; student is the person training in a teacher education program.

[3]Margaret Lindsey, "Competency-Based Teacher Education and Certification in New York State: An Overview", Teachers College Record, 77 (May 1976), pp. 507-508; Theodore E. Andrews, "Certification" in Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects, eds. Robert W. Houston and Robert B. Howsam (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972), pp. 162-163.

[4]AACTE Committee on PBTE, Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations, PBTE Series: No. 16, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1974), p. 27.

[5]Malcolm A. Lowther, "Most and Least Helpful Activities of Supervising Teachers", Clearing House 43 (September 1968), p. 40; Carol K. Tittle, Student Teaching Attitudes and Research Bases for Change in School and University (New Jersey: The Scarecow Press, Inc., 1974), p. 47; Thomas J. Brown and Serafina Fiore Banich, Student Teaching in an Elementary School - Guiding a Student Teacher (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), p. 8; Jay A. Monson and Aldon M. Bebb, "New Roles For The Supervisor of Student Teaching" in Teacher Education: Trends, Issues, Innovations, eds. Lowell Horton and Phyllis Horton (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1974), p. 288.

[6]Spearman rank order correlation formula used: $R=1-\frac{6\Sigma D^2}{N(N^2-1)}$

[7]The competencies within the text are in abbreviated form. See Figure 2 for unabbreviated form.